

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/068,278	Applicant(s) LOCHER ET AL.	
	Examiner Erica E Cadugan	Art Unit 3722	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Erica E Cadugan. (3)_____.

(2) Robert Kestenbaum. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 04 June 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: n/a.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

ell

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner called to find out if a response to the final office action mailed November 22, 2002 had been filed, or if the case was abandoned, noting that the interview summary in the case (paper No. 31) mailed March 13, 2003 indicated that the letter Mr. Kestenbaum filed on March 10, 2003 (while Examiner Cadugan was on extended leave) did not address all of the outstanding rejections and issues, and that the interview summary clearly stated that applicant's time for response to the final rejection mailed on 11/22/2002 was still running. Mr. Kestenbaum stated that the time period for response had been restarted by Examiner Wellington, and that he still had time to respond. Noting that the case file did not contain any indication of a restart of the time period for response, and again noting that the interview summary mailed March 10, 2003 clearly stated that the time for response was continuing to run from 11/22/02, Examiner asked Mr. Kestenbaum to fax a copy of the papers he received that indicated a restart of the time period. Mr. Kestenbaum faxed the attached sheets (pp. 1-22). Examiner reviewed the faxed sheets, and recontacted Mr. Kestenbaum, indicating that what he faxed appeared to be a copy of the same interview summary (paper no. 31) that Examiner mentioned previously that indicated that time was still running from 11/22/02, and also appeared to be a courtesy copy of the final office action that had been mailed 11/22/02, which courtesy copy was faxed from the PTO (as evidenced by the date stamp in the upper left corner of the apparent courtesy copy) by an unknown individual. Examiner indicated that there appeared to be no paperwork in the fax indicating that the time period had been restarted. Mr. Kestenbaum stated that the last page of the office action that he faxed to the Examiner indicated that there was a three-month shortened statutory period for response, and that he was still inside that three-month time period. Mr. Kestenbaum also stated that he was under the impression that the office action he faxed to the Examiner was sent to him by the office in response to the letter that he filed on March 10, 2003. Examiner stated that our records did not show any mailing of such an office action (in response to his letter), again noted that the interview summary clearly stated that the letter filed on March 10, 2003 was being treated as a miscellaneous letter since it did not address the art rejections in the case, again noted that the interview summary clearly stated that the time period continued to run from Nov. 2002, and also noted that the date on the last page of the office action faxed by Mr. Kestenbaum was November 19, 2002, which was the same date that was on the last page of the office action mailed November 22, 2002. .



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
 Washington, D.C. 20531
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/068,278	07/09/1998	BEAT LOCHER	ROSS11-PC/P	2154

7590

03/13/2003

M ROBERT KESTENBAUM
 11011 BERMUDA DUNES NE
 ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87111

EXAMINER

CADUGAN, ERICA E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3722

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/068,278	LOCHER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	A. L. Wellington	3722	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) A. L. Wellington. (3) _____

(2) Robert Kestenbaum. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 12 March 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: n/a.

Identification of prior art discussed: Wolermann '926 and Koch '598.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Verified receipt of priority claim argument of Swiss Application 3235 (paper # 30). Informed applicant that there are outstanding rejections and issues that were not addressed nor overcome by the priority of the Swiss document therefore the paper received will be entered as a miscellaneous paper and applicant's time for response to the Final Rejection mailed on 11/22/02 is still running.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

A. L. WELLINGTON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135, (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent and Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters; directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiner's Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Serial Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case unless both applicant and examiner agree that the examiner will record same. Where the examiner agrees to record the substance of the interview, or when it is adequately recorded on the Form or in an attachment to the Form, the examiner should check the appropriate box at the bottom of the Form which informs the applicant that the submission of a separate record of the substance of the interview as a supplement to the Form is not required.

It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner.
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSION OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
 Washington, D.C. 20531
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/068,278	07/09/1998	BEAT LOCHER	ROSS11-PC/P	2154

7590 03/13/2003
 M ROBERT KESTENBAUM
 11011 BERMUDA DUNES NE
 ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87111

EXAMINER

CADUGAN, ERICA E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3722

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

Application/Control Number: 09/068,278
Art Unit: 3722

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION***Faxing of Responses to Office Actions***

1. In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, TC 3700 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Group at (703) 872-9302. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into TC 3700 will be promptly forwarded to the examiner.

Election/Restrictions

2. For purposes of clarity, for the reasons set forth in the office action mailed February 27, 2001, claims 39-130 are pending in this application and of these, claims 50-74, 83, 86, 91-99, 114, 119, 124, and 126-130 are withdrawn from consideration.

Oath/Declaration

3. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02. While it is recognized that Applicant stated, in the response submitted August 27, 2002, that "[A]pplicant will promptly submit a Declaration making the appropriate changes to this application, as necessary", until Applicant has done so, the present objection to the declaration still applies.

To restate the previously set forth explanation of why the oath or declaration is defective, the oath or declaration is defective because: it improperly claims benefit under 35 USC 120 (in the most recently filed declaration - in the older one it improperly claimed benefit of this

Application/Control Number: 09/068,278

Page 3

Art Unit: 3722

application under 35 USC 119) of PCT/EP97/05216. Note that the present application was filed under 35 USC 371 as being the national stage application of PCT/EO97/05216, and that the notice of acceptance of the present application under 35 USC 371 (paper number 6) was mailed on July 14, 1999. Thus, the present application thus may not claim benefit of the filing date of the international application of which it is the national stage since its filing date is the date of filing of that international application. See MPEP §1893.03(c). In other words, it is improper for the present 371 application to claim priority to itself.

It is noted that Applicant stated (on page 22 of the response submitted 8/27/02) the following:

In numbered paragraph 12, the Examiner quotes Applicant's statement that the application was filed as a national stage application. Applicant's statement referred to the entry of this application into the National Stage under 35 USC 371. Thereafter, an RCE was filed on October 18, 2001. We respectfully request that the Examiner make note of this to correct any confusion on this point.

It appears that from these statements that Applicant may be asserting that by filing an RCE of the present National Stage application filed under 35 USC 371, the present application is no longer a National Stage application filed under 35 USC 371. However, this is not the case. See, for example, MPEP section 706.07(h), which states that an "RCE is in fact continued examination of the same application", filed under statutory authority from 35 USC 132(b), i.e., is not a "new" application filed under statutory authority from 35 USC 111(a), 120, or 121. Thus, the above explanation, previously provided, about the deficiencies of the declaration, has not changed.

A new declaration is required, as indicated above, correcting the above-noted deficiencies.

FILED
NEW DOCUMENT
CLASS.
PCT-EP-96
104792
5/1/03 3:35

Application/Control Number: 09/068,278
Art Unit: 3722

Page 4

Priority

4. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35

U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) to PCT/EP96/04790. A request for the certified copy of this application has been made to WIPO. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for priority under 35

U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) based upon an application No. 3235/95 filed in Switzerland on November 6, 1995. A claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) cannot be based on said application, since the International Application of which the present application is the national stage

(PCT/EP97/05216) was filed more than twelve months thereafter. See 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-

(d)), and particularly section 119(a) which states the following: (a) An application for patent for an invention filed in this country by any person who has, or whose legal representatives or assigns have, previously regularly filed an application for a patent for the same invention in a foreign country which affords similar privileges in the case of applications filed in the United States or to citizens of the United States, or in a WTO member country, shall have the same effect as the same application would have if filed in this country on the date on which the application for patent for the same invention was first filed in such foreign country, if the application in this country is filed within twelve months from the earliest date on which such foreign application was filed; but no patent shall be granted on any application for patent for an invention which had been patented or described in a printed publication in any country more than one year before the date of the actual filing of the application in this country, or which had been in public use or on sale in this country more than one year prior to such filing.

In the instant case, the application in this country, i.e., PCT/EP97/05216, which is an international application designating the U.S., was filed on September 23, 1997, which is later than twelve months from the date of filing of the Swiss application no. 3235/95, filed November 6, 1995, and thus, PCT/EP97/05216 is not entitled under 35 USC 119 to the priority date of Swiss application no. 3235/95.

Additionally note that the claim for priority to the Swiss application No. 3235/95 was not made in the request of the International application of which the present application is the

Application/Control Number: 09/068,278
Art Unit: 3722

Page 5

national stage. For purposes of clarity, the present application is a 371 of PCT/EP97/05216 (filing date of PCT is 9/23/1997), and additionally, a proper claim for priority under 35 USC 119 to the following applications has been made: Swiss Application 2329/36 (filing date 9/23/1996) and PCT/EP96/04790 (filing date 11/4/1996). *Drawings*

6. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "group of cable processing tools" consisting of at least one of "clamping tools, marking apparatuses and grinders" of claim 43 and the processing station comprising at least one transport or processing station, selected from the group consisting of "an insulation stripping station, a sawing station, a cutting station, a twisting station, a shaping station, a crimping station, a soldering station, a cable processing station, and a manipulator" of claim 101 must each be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

7. Note also that the Form PTO-948 (Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review) that was an attachment to paper number 12 objected to the drawings because of the German captions, among other things.

8. Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in reply to this Office action. However, formal correction of the noted defect may be deferred until after the examiner has considered the proposed drawing correction. Failure to timely submit the proposed drawing correction will result in the abandonment of the application.

9. Corrected or substitute drawings were submitted on August 27, 2002. Specifically, a proposed new Figure 33 was submitted to attempt to show the claimed features indicated in the office action mailed February 27, 2002 as not being shown. Applicant has cited a number of

Application/Control Number: 09/068,278

Page 6

Art Unit: 3722

locations in the specification as originally filed for providing support for the newly-filed Figure.

However, none of these locations teach the level of detail shown in the proposed Figure 33.

However, note that claim 43 sets forth plural tool holders in a "lateral direction", (which lateral is "sideward" with respect to the transport path of the cable, per claim 39). Newly proposed Figure 33 does not show lateral plural toolholders holding at least two tools selected from the group of cable processing tools consisting of at least one of "clamping tools, marking tools, and grinders" as set forth in claim 43, but instead shows marking rollers 205, 206 (per the paragraph added to the specification, page 42, before the last paragraph, that describes Figure 33, in the response filed 8/27/2001) spaced longitudinally along the transport path from holders holding cutting knives, spaced longitudinally from grinders 208, 209 (per the paragraph added to the specification, page 42, before the last paragraph, that describes Figure 33, in the response filed 8/27/2001), and thus claim 43 does not provide support for newly-proposed Figure 33.

Regarding the assertion (p. 22 of the response filed August 27, 2002) with respect to original claim 14, original claim 14 depended from any of the preceding claims, including original claim 2, and original claim 2 depended from original claim 1. Original claim 1 set forth "at least one knife station", original claim 2 further set forth that "the knife station for receiving a plurality of tools is formed transversely with respect to the transport path so that each tool can be positioned in a working position along the transport path, at least two, optionally continuously positionable, holding apparatuses being provided for the tools, and the tools being selected from the group consisting of the cable-processing tools, for example, comprising: knives, crimping tools, twisting tools, punching tools, clamping apparatuses, marking apparatuses, grinding apparatuses, etc.", and original claim 14 further set forth "wherein a plurality of tool support feed

Application/Control Number: 09/068,278

Page 7

Art Unit: 3722

means having a plurality of tool supports (1,2) are arranged along the axis". Note that nothing in these claims, nor in the specification as originally filed, provides the level of detail shown in newly-proposed Figure 33. For example, nothing in the specification as originally filed teaches the order of the marking, cutting, and grinding devices shown in new Figure 33, nothing teaches that the marker is a roller-type marker, nothing teaches that the grinder is a roller-type grinder. Additionally, these claims set forth "at least two, optionally continuously positionable holding apparatuses provided for the tools", e.g., markers, grinders, clamping apparatuses, etc., (see original claim 2). Note that Figure 2 does not show the marking and grinding devices in the originally-claimed manner, but rather shows rollers that are not held by any "holding apparatuses".

Therefore, newly-proposed Figure 33 constitutes new matter as the specification as originally filed did not provide support for the arrangement of tools set forth in this figure.

Therefore, the proposed drawing correction submitted August 27, 2002, is not approved.

10. Additionally, note that there are other types of stations set forth in claim 101 as described above that are not shown in proposed Figure 33, and thus proposed Figure 33 does not overcome the objection to the drawings as not showing details of all elements of the claimed invention.

Specification

11. The amendment filed August 27, 2001 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: the new paragraph describing Figure 33. Note that the specification as originally filed does not provide support for the particular arrangement

Application/Control Number: 09/068,278
Art Unit: 3722

of tools set forth in this paragraph, as described in the above explanation about why Figure 33 is not approved.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

12. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
13. Claims 40, 75-82, 100-113, 115-116, and 125 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 40, 75-82, 100-113, 115-116, and 125 are replete with instances that do not particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of applicant's invention. Examples of these instances are listed below, but these instances are not limited to the listed examples. Applicant is advised to closely review the indicated claims for other occurrences. It is noted that Applicant, on pages 20-21 of the response filed August 27, 2002, made a number of explanations to try to clarify many of the issues with respect to 35 USC 112, second paragraph that were pointed out by the examiner in the office action mailed February 27, 2002. However, it is noted that in many cases, Applicant did not amend the claims in question. For example, in the rejection of claim 40 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, the Examiner stated that "it is unclear how the upper and lower positions of the tools "can be combined" as claimed", for which Applicant provided an explanation on page 20 of the aforementioned response. However, Applicant did not amend this claim. Thus, the rejection still applies, because it is unclear as set forth in the claim how or in what regard the "upper and lower positions" of the tools "can be combined".

Application/Control Number: 09/068,278
Art Unit: 3722

Page 9

There are several positively recited limitations that lack sufficient antecedent bases in the claims. The following list of examples is not meant to be all-inclusive. Examples of these instances are: "said clamping and centering apparatus" in claim 77; "said processing station" in claim 79 (plural different ones previously set forth); "said clamping and centering jaws" in claim 77; "the rotatable blade" in claim 82 (previously at least one); "said clamping and centering apparatus" (previously "at least one") in claim 113; "said transport path" in claim 115, etc. Applicant is required to review the indicated claims for further similar instances.

In claim 82, it appears that in line 2, "and" should be changed to --or-- to be consistent with the alternative "or" provided in claim 75. Otherwise, it is unclear how many rotatable blades applicant is intending to set forth, as claim 75 only provides one rotatable blade via the alternative "or" in line 3.

As set forth in claim 100, it is unclear as claimed in what regard a "path", i.e., a location, is "coordinated" with a "processing station". As a side note, it is noted that the structure of claim 100 is not tied or related in any way via any claim language to the structure set forth in claim 88.

In claim 107, it is unclear via the use of the indefinite article "a" as claimed whether "a tool support" is intended to be a subset of the "at least one tool support" previously set forth (in claim 88).

In claim 40, it is unclear how the upper and lower positions of the tools "can be combined" as claimed.

In claims 75 and 108, it is unclear as claimed whether "the first processing station" (cl. 75, "the processing station" in cl. 108) comprises (in one alternative) "a second processing station", or whether the "apparatus" comprises either of a "first" (cl. 75, "a processing station" in

Application/Control Number: 09/068,278
Art Unit: 3722

Page 10

cl. 108) or a "second" processing station. Also in claim 75, it is unclear from "at least one transport path" what the path is a transport of, i.e., for transporting what?

In claim 107, as amended, the scope of the claim is unclear because it is unclear as claimed what actuators are encompassed by the limitation of "a motor-controlled actuator (101) known per se", i.e., it is unclear exactly what constitutes a "known per se" motor-controlled actuator. Examiner suggests deleting "known per se" from this claim.

In claim 125, it is unclear as claimed in what regard the action of opening and closing the belts is "cable-shape dependent".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

14. Claims 88, 39-45, 89, 90, 84, 117, and 123, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent No. 09-046844 (Tomoji).

15. Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a certified translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

16. Tomoji discloses the claimed invention comprising: a pair of tool supports (not numbered, but attached to the bottoms of supporting bodies 4, 4'), at least two tools 7 in pairs 7A-7D (see Figure 2), and a tool support feed 3 above a first transport path (not numbered but coincident with 8), along which a cable/wire 8 is inserted in a feed direction, wherein the tool support feed 3 is formed for a controlled lateral drive along moving rails 5, 5' (see Figure 2 and abstract, lines 4-5 of the "Solution" section) for controlled sideward movement of the tool supports. Note that rails 5, 5' are perpendicular to the vertical (as viewed in Figure 2) working direction of the tools. Also note, with respect to claim 88, that the lateral positioning of the tool

Page 11

4014

Application/Control Number: 09/068,278
Art Unit: 3722

Page 12

17. Claims 88, 39, 41-49, 75-79, 81, 84, 85, 89, 100-113, 115-118, and 121-123, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,879,926 (Wollermann et al.). Wollermann et al. teaches a wire insulation stripping apparatus (shown in Figure 1 as a whole) having programmable strippers 12 at workstations WS (see Figure 1 and column 9) for stripping the ends of wire segments 18 that are continuously fed via conveyor mechanism 11 (see Figure 1). Each workstation WS (there are two such workstations shown in Figure 1) has a turret 76 (Figures 1, 2, 7, 8). Each turret 76 has an upper sector 77B and a lower sector 77A (see Figures 2 and 10 specifically). Each of these sectors has a plurality of insulation cutting means such as 101A and 101B including knives such as 91A and 91B arranged in pairs (Figures 10, 7, and 2, and column 11, lines 27-44 and column 12, lines 1-19). The upper and lower sectors 77B and 77A constitute "tool supports". The turret 76 is rotated about the axis of shaft 43 by a drive means 90 that includes a step motor 92 (Figures 3 and 7 and column 11, lines 57-60). Note that control of the various drives taught by Wollermann are effected by a CPU (column 9, lines 20-24), and that a sensor is employed in conjunction with the CPU to signal a home position when a wire to be stripped is in position (column 16, lines 33-42). Also note that as the turret 76 is rotated, the tool supports 77A and B will be moved in a direction that is perpendicular to the working direction of the tools (as the tool working direction extends into the paper as viewed in Figure 1 and the direction of movement of the tool supports 77A and B is in the plane of the paper as viewed in Figure 1). Note that the embodiment shown in Figures 7 and 8 has six mounting portions 87, each of which can have a pair of blades mounted thereto, and that thus the supports can be controlled to at least six different positions. With respect to claim 39, note that the feed direction of the wire or cable 18 is vertically as

Application/Control Number: 09/068,278

Page 13

Art Unit: 3722

shown in Figure 1, and that the bisecting centerline of each wire or cable 18 (would be vertical as shown in Figure 1) defines a "first transport path" as the wire or cable 18 is fed via the conveyor 11. With respect to claim 41, the upper and lower tool supports 77B and 77A are both mounted on shaft 43 for rotational movement therewith (column 11, lines 3-6 and 46-47). With respect to claim 44, the tool supports 77B and 77A have mounted thereon slide members 106B and 106A (Figures 10 and 4) which in turn have mounted thereon the blades 91B and 91A (Figures 4 and 10 and column 15, lines 11-12). Actuation of transducers 171A and 171B actuates the slide members 106B and 106A of the tool supports toward and away from one another, which is also toward and away from the first transport path (Figure 4 and column 15, lines 11-20). With respect to claim 46, note that the cable or wire 18 is fed between pairs of blades 91B and 91A (Figures 2-5). With respect to claims 75 and 108, note that the blades are mounted to a rotating turret 76 as described above, and that the axis of rotation of the turret extends along shaft 43 which is "along", i.e., beside or at hand to, the first transport path as set forth above. With respect to claims 76 and 109, the cable or wire 18 is held via gripping and guiding means 141 while being incised with the blades 91A, 91B (column 16, line 56 through column 17, line 1). As viewed in Figure 4, the gripping and guiding means 141 utilizes upper and lower gripping jaws 152 and 151 to grip the wire 18 on two sides thereof. As the gripping and guiding means 141 is guiding the wire to a desired position and then holding it there (note "gripping" and "guiding" means), it inherently holds the wire 18 in a "centered" manner. Also note that the gripping jaws 152 and 151 are in the immediate vicinity of the blades 91A and 91B (see Figure 4). With respect to claim 110, the blade and clamping drives are "coupled" via common control by the CPU. With respect to claim 111, as best understood, the clamping and blade drives are

Application/Control Number: 09/068,278
Art Unit: 3722

Page 14

"separated" in that they do not function simultaneously (columns 16-17). With respect to claims 112 and 113, note that while the gripping jaws are holding the wire 18, they do not rotate. With respect to claim 77, note that a vertical plane that is in the plane of the paper as viewed in Figure 4 could intersect or contain both of the gripping jaws 152 and 151 such that they would "lie" in a plane, and that each jaw has a retaining surface (not labeled, but shown as approximately horizontal in Figure 4). Note that it is "possible" to close the jaws 152 and 151 to approximately zero cable diameter by pivoting them about pivot shafts 157 and 156 until the jaws meet (see Figure 4). With respect to claim 78, note that the gripping and guiding means 141 has a slide frame 142 that reciprocates in the direction of arrows 198 and 199 (see Figures 6 and 11 and column 14, lines 12-19), and that the gripping and guiding means 141 comprises set screws 158 and 159 that function as stops to vary the open spacing between the gripper jaws 152 and 151 (column 14, lines 29-37). Specifically regarding claim 79, the workstations WS include the blade turret 76 and the gripping and guiding means 141. The workstations WS each constitute "automatic processing modules", and are "removably" mounted on the cable processing machine (shown as a whole in Figure 1), in that the workstations can or are "able" to be removed via removing machine bolts 26 (see column 9, lines 45-58 and Figures 2-4). Specifically regarding claim 81, jaws 152 and 151 are part of arms 149 and 148 which are shown in Figure 4 as "L-shaped", and the jaws 152 and 151 each have a serrated gripping portion (column 14, lines 39-41) that covers a "substantial" axial range of a cable sheath and ends that project directly adjacent to the knives 91A and 91B (see Figure 4). With respect to claims 84 and 117, as best understood, applicant is claiming that at least one from the list of (1) upper and lower roller, (2) continuous belts of a pair of rollers, (3) a pair of continuous belts, and (4) upper and lower tool

Application/Control Number: 09/068,278
Art Unit: 3722

Page 15

holders, has each of the plurality of items (i.e., if item (1) is met, both the upper and the lower roller) displaceable as claimed. Wollermann teaches that the slide members 106B and 106A (described above) are mounted on tool supports 77B and 77A for movement toward and away from one another, which is also toward and away from the first transport path (Figure 4 and column 15, lines 11-20). With respect to claims 85 and 118, note that the arms 148 and 149 can be "swiveled" downwardly and upwardly about pivot shafts 156 and 157. With respect to claim 100, note that the conveyor mechanism 11 is composed of two spaced apart conveyor units 16 and 17, one of which is stationary and one of which is laterally adjustable (column 9, lines 31-37) via movable carriage 31 (column 10, lines 43-55). As described above, the bisecting centerline of the wires 18 (would be vertical as viewed in Figure 1) describes a transport path. If the carriage 31 is moved in the direction of arrows 74A and 74B (Figure 7, column 10, lines 43-55, which is to the left or right as viewed in Figure 1), a different bisecting centerline would be defined, and thus a different transport path would be defined. With respect to the further processing station, as described above, there are plural stripper 12 workstations WS, and additionally, there are also terminal applying stations 19 (Figure 1 and column 9, lines 32-44) which could constitute any of the "shaping station", the "crimping station", or the "cable processing station" set forth in claim 101. With respect to claim 102, the carriage 31 is mounted in linear guideways 23 (column 9, lines 55-58) transversely to the transport paths as described above, and "can be" moved via a drive apparatus including step motor 58 (column 10, lines 43-52). Specifically regarding claim 103, as previously described, conveyor units 16 and 17 serve to transport the cable or wire 18, and could be considered with respect to this particular claim to be "transporters", and as viewed in Figure 1, the conveyors 16 and 17 each extend vertically

Application/Control Number: 09/068,278
Art Unit: 3722

Page 16

beyond the top and bottom (constituting the "both sides" claimed) of each of the stripping 12 stations WS. With respect to claims 104 and 105, the CPU controls all of the drives in prearranged sequences (column 9, lines 20-24). With respect to claim 107, note that the claim is not a method claim, and that Wollermann teaches the claimed apparatus structure of a transporter (the carriage 31 in this instance) that is connected to the blade station WS by the step motor 58 that positions both the carriage 31 and the stripping device (i.e., the turret 76 and the gripping and guiding means 141) as the stripping device is attached to the carriage (column 10, lines 43-64). Note that the adjustment of carriage 31 could result in a "diametrically opposite" transverse "adjustment" of the stripping station WS as they can be moved relative to one another (column 10, lines 63-64). With respect to claim 115, note for example that the carriage 31 (which could be considered a transporter) has ultimately mounted thereon the knives 91A and 91B which are movable "symmetrically with respect to the transport path as described above. With respect to claim 106, note that the two conveyors 16 and 17 are also controlled by the CPU.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. Claims 87, 120, and 125, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,879,926 (Wollermann et al.) as applied to claims 88 and 39 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,109,598 (Koch). Wollermann et al. teaches all aspects of the invention as claimed in claims 87, 120, and 125 as described in the above rejection based thereon, but does not teach that the cable drives 16 and 17 are belt drives. Koch teaches a driving system for clamping and driving a cable 18 utilizing a stationary belt drive 1 (Figures 1 and 2, column 4, lines 12-15) and a displaceable belt drive 2 (Figures 1 and 2 and column 4, lines 22-25). Koch's belt drives are coordinated with the cable-working (in this case, a stripper and

Application/Control Number: 09/068,278
Art Unit: 3722

Page 17

terminal applicator) device (column 6, lines 4-25). In the cable driving devices 16 and 17 taught by Wollermann, very little detail is provided. Note that in Figure 4 of Wollermann, it appears that the wire or cable 18 is passed through an oversized bore in conveyor 17 so as to be conveyed thereby. This system, while allowing a variety of wire diameters to be used, does not provide for firm gripping of the wire 18 by the conveyor 17, which could lead to manufacturing error. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have substituted each of the conveyors 16 and 17 taught by Wollermann et al. with first and second belt drives (for a total of four belt drives) as taught by Koch and to have coordinated the movement of these belt drives with the CPU taught by Wollermann et al. for the purpose of increasing manufacturing accuracy by providing that the transported wires are positively clamped by the conveyors.

Allowable Subject Matter

19. Claims 80 and 82, as best understood, would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

20. Applicant's arguments submitted August 27, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

21. It appears that Applicant's arguments with respect to any prior art rejection appear to be based on Applicant's assertions that Applicant is entitled to the priority date of Swiss application 3235/95 filed November 6, 1995. However, this is not persuasive. Firstly, Applicant is not entitled to the priority of the Swiss application 3235/95 for the reasons described above.

Application/Control Number: 09/068,278
Art Unit: 3722

Page 18

Additionally, with respect to the Tomoji reference (Japanese Patent Document 09046844), note that the publication date of the Tomoji reference is February 14, 1997, and thus, the Tomoji reference is prior art under 35 USC 102(a) because Applicant has not provided a certified translation of the priority documents being relied upon to overcome the Tomoji reference (specifically, of the Swiss 2329/36 application filed 9/23/1996).

①
PROVIDE
CERT. TRANS.
OF SWISS
2329/36 TO
OVERCOME
TOMOJI

22. Additionally, note that the other art rejections pending in the case are based on art that would not be overcome even with the 1995 date of the Swiss application. For example, note that U.S. Pat. No. 4,879,926 (Wollermann et al.) was published in 1989.

②
ANALYZE
WO 01/02004

23. Also, with respect to Applicant's assertions regarding "the enclosed WO publication sheet 98/13907, with inter-line translation", it is noted firstly, that the copy of this document provided by Applicant does not match the copy of this document provided to the USPTO by WIPO and thus the document supplied by Applicant cannot be relied upon by the Examiner for making any determinations. Secondly, it is noted that, even for the sake of argument, if the document supplied by applicant was able to be relied upon, note that for the detailed reasons set forth above, Applicant is still not entitled to the 1995 filing date of the Swiss application 3235/95.

③
SUBMIT
COPY OF
SEP 96
04790
CLAIMING
PRIORITY OF
SWISS
3235

Conclusion

24. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Application/Control Number: 09/068,278
Art Unit: 3722

Page 19

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erica E. Cadogan whose telephone number is (703) 308-6395. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrea L. Wellington can be reached on (703) 308-2159. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9302 for regular communications and (703) 872-9303 for After Final communications. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

u

ec

November 19, 2002

A. L. Wellington
A. L. WELLINGTON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700